Pre-Submission Synopsis
On

BEYOND DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE: A QUEST FOR HUMAN EQUALITY

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

SUBMITTED BY
SANJIT BARMAN
REG. NO. [R-18RS07120135]

UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF
DR. BARADA LAXMI PANDA
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

PRESIDENCY UNIVERSITY
KOLKATA

30/03/2026

Dr. Barada Laxmi Panda
Assistant Professor
Department of Philosophy
Presidency University
Kolkata

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
PRESIDENCY UNIVERSITY
KOLKATA – 700073

2025

Introduction:

Marcus Tullius Cicero, the Roman Philosopher, famously states that "a political society founded upon the notion of justice."[i] According to Cicero, a society (*republic*) "cannot be governed without the most *absolute justice*…nor even continue to exist."[ii] Following Cicero's theme St. Augustine in his famous book *The City of God* rhetorically asked "Justice being taken away, then what are the kingdoms but great robbers?"[iii] According to Plato justice is "the original principle, laid down at the foundation of the state…it is "the condition of every other virtue of the state."[iv] For Aristotle, "Justice is the bond of men in states, for the administration of justice, which is the determination of what is just, is the principle of order in political society."[v] Rawls in his book opined that "justice is the first notion of social institution, as truth is of the system of thought."[vi] The essence of all these statements is the same—justice is the foundation of all societies or states. It is the idea of justice on which every state itself is founded. No state can exist without the ideal of justice. Any state that doesn't have a sense of justice is nothing but a gang of criminals. As Augustine states, however imperfect the justice is in the state; it is the most significant principle of correction of mankind. It is the remedy of curing evils in the society. Therefore, the concept of justice is inherent in the idea of a state.

Significance of the Study:

Historically originating through social thought, justice is a genuine concept of the human mind. As it doesn't influence the internal process of life, it is neither a code of ethics nor a morality. The ideal of justice governs external life—the relations of people within the social system. In this context, it is noteworthy that although justice is in and of itself not a morality, it is founded on morality. Further, even though justice is not ethics in and of itself, ultimately ethics is the source of justice. As the foundation of the state, justice is not only a political ideal but also a principle of social organisation aimed at the overall well-being of society. As Barker states "Justice is the reconciler and the synthesis of political values: it is their union in an adjusted and integrated whole."[vii] According to Plato, justice is the first virtue of the individual and society. From the individual perspective, justice is a virtue of character. From the social point of view, justice is a principle of human society that

makes the state harmonious and just. According to Plato, justice "is the true principle of social life."[viii] It is that principle which upholds human relationships and provides the rights to each individual, they are entitled to as a member of the system. However, the principle of justice is not only the ideal of granting rights to the individual, it is also the principle of distribution of rights. It maintains the societal balance objectively. The human figure standing in front of the world's court, holding scales and wearing a black cloth over his eyes, represents the impartial and neutral distribution of rights.

In his *Nichomachean Ethics*, Aristotle refers to justice as a complete virtue. According to Aristotle, justice is the most notable and perfect virtue that encourages people to act justly, desire what is just, and practice justice in society. It is a complete virtue because the one who possesses this virtue can exercise it not only in his interest but also for other people. Consider the following statement of Aristotle: "Justice is complete virtue, not without qualification, but in relation to another person…it is often held that justice is the greatest of the virtues."[ix] Aristotle further said that justice is the only virtue because it is always considered good for others, that is, justice is beneficial for everyone, whether a fellow citizen or a high-ranking official. St. Thomas Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas, the two major Western medieval political theorists, both emphasise the importance of justice as a fundamental virtue of society. They both believed that without justice no social order or peace can exist. For them, justice promotes harmony and peace among individuals and helps men to connect with the Almighty God. Augustine in his famous book *The City of God* defines justice as 'the virtue of fraternity' and the task of justice is "to see that to each is given what belongs to each."[x] It implies that Augustine views justice as the first and foremost act of love in which the dues of others are paid. Through social justice, the respect for the rights of individuals is secured in two ways: through fair transactions between individuals and the state's proportional distribution of benefits based on social functions.[xi] St. Thomas Aquinas also recognises justice as a cardinal virtue and an appropriate course of action. For him, justice is "a habit whereby men renders to each one his due by a constant and perpetual will."[xii] To Aquinas, justice is an intrinsic principle of human action. Regarding the nature and importance of justice consider the following remarks of Aquinas: "It is proper to justice, as compared with the other virtues, to direct man in his relations with others: because it denotes a kind of equality, as its very name

implies…for equality is in reference of one thing to some other."[xiii] It suggests that, for Aquinas, justice is a quality that promotes equality in human relationships. Hence, justice can only be achieved if and only if people can form harmonious relationships.

Like Plato and Aristotle, Rawls also in his celebrated book *A Theory of Justice* famously said that "Justice is the first virtue of social institution, as truth is of system of thought."[xiv] It implies that justice is a social principle relating to the fundamental structure of society that regulates human action, protects individual rights and distributes resources. It is a guiding principle for societal relationships. We cannot imagine a society that is not based on the concept of justice. For Rawls, justice is both a social principle and a scheme, which simultaneously determines the means and method of distribution of rights, opportunities, and duties among the members of the society. In determining the essence of justice, Rawls differentiates between a concept of justice and a conception of justice. Justice as a concept signifies a "proper balance between competing claims from a conception of justice as a set of related principles for identifying the relevant considerations which determine this balance."[xv] He illustrates this distinction as follows "the role of its principles in assigning rights and duties and in defining the appropriate division of social advantages. A conception of justice is an interpretation of this role."[xvi] In this interpretation, justice is a principle of distribution of social goods among the members of a society.

According to D. D. Raphael, justice has two aspects: the conservative and the reformative.[xvii] The conservative role of justice can be defined as ensuring the basic rights of individuals, which they are entitled to as born free and equal human beings, by eradicating natural injustices and inequalities. Establishing just situations by eliminating discrimination based on gender, caste, social security, legal claims, right to property and right to life are the conservative aspects of justice. In other words, conservative justice serves two purposes: the protection and distribution of the natural rights of individuals. Consider the *Decent Minimum Theory* (DMT) of Alex Rajczi as the best expression of the conservative aspect of justice: the "deserving individuals such as children, the disabled, and the elderly—but also including hardworking able-bodied adults— have a pro tanto entitlement to reasonable access to the things needed for a minimally decent life, such as

food, housing, security, and medical care. If the private market doesn't provide access, the government has reason to enact social safety net programs that guarantee access."[xviii]

The reformative aspect of justice is crucial. The main concern of this aspect of justice is to transform the individuals' existing status to bring them to the mainstream of social life. Looking at the relevant differences between individuals, this type of justice aims to reduce those differences. The approach reformative justice follows is twofold. Firstly, it looks at the merit or desert of an individual to distribute something, such as rights, or rewards. Secondly, it concentrates on the needs of the people; who are socially backward and somehow, unable to compete and connect themselves with mainstream society. This type of justice with the help of the distribution of social goods tries to make the situation fairer or just. It is noteworthy that, in the sense we use the idea of justice today, centred around this conception of justice. In modern language, it is termed as 'Social Justice.'

The fundamental elements of reformative justice appear to be 'distribution' and 'distributive justice.' Since ancient times, there have been two ideas of distribution—one is distribution according to 'merit' or 'desert' and the other is 'distribution according to needs.' According to the distribution according to 'merit' or 'desert', an individual should be given what he or she deserves according to his or her merit. In essence, it holds the idea that a person will be rewarded in proportion to his deeds; if a person acts justly he will be rewarded according to his good deeds, and for a person's bad action he will be punished in the same proportion of his bad action. For instance, if there is a question of appointment or promotion to a particular post, the appointment should be given to the most qualified person; or, for awarding a scholarship the most eligible candidate should be chosen, these are examples of distribution according to the merit. On the other hand, the 'distribution according to needs' has a different basis. According to this view, since every individual is naturally a free and equal human being, everyone has an equal claim to equality. It holds that any kind of inequality or injustice is bad for society. Giving benefits to those already gifted with enough natural talent doesn't only widen the gap between people but also increases social inequality. Reformative justice seeks to eliminate these gaps between people and establish a just and equitable society.

There is no room for debate regarding the conservative orientation to justice. From philosophers to ordinary people, almost everyone has unquestionably endorsed the imperatives of conservative justice. However, there are endless debates regarding the reformative orientation to justice. Some philosophers defend 'merit-based' distribution as fair, while others emphasise the 'need-based' distribution. The supporter of 'need-based' distribution refers to 'merit-based' as ordinary distribution and therefore, insubstantial. They argue that only the distribution based on the needs of the people can eliminate inequalities among citizens and establish a just and harmonious social order. Whatever it may be, in essence, distributive justice seems to be the best and most effective approach to developing a fair, just and harmonious society.

The Objective of the Thesis:

The main objective of the thesis is to undertake a critical philosophical examination of the approaches to distributive justice. Philosophical analysis not only clarifies the concepts involved but also reveals the underlying philosophical frameworks. Therefore, a philosophical investigation of distributive justice theories, on the one hand, enhances the understanding of its foundational ideas and on the other hand, also uncovers new insights into the nature and implications of distributive justice. In short, the main objectives of the present thesis include:

1. To critically analyse and evaluate existing theories of justice and distributive justice.

2. To critically examine the role of distributive justice in addressing social and economic inequality.

3. To explore the limitations of distributive justice theories in establishing a just society.

4. To identify an alternative framework beyond the redistribution of wealth and benefits.

5. To propose a new perspective or framework that addresses these limitations.

Research Questions:

The key questions guiding this research, through which we seek to achieve our objective are:

1. What is the true nature of justice and social justice?

2. As the central aspect of social justice, what are the fundamental principles of distributive justice? What role does it play in addressing social injustices? What are its significance and limitations?

3. Are there any alternative theories for establishing a just social system beyond distributive justice? If yes, how do they differ from distributive justice, and what perspectives do they adopt?

4. What are the role the alternative justice model can play in addressing social injustices and establishing a more just and harmonious society?

Research Methodology:

Since this research is within the domain of political philosophy, with a specific focus on distributive justice, the methodology used is primarily qualitative and theoretical. It is qualitative research because we have adopted a philosophical inquiry which involves critical analysis, conceptual clarification, and normative reasoning. A critical analysis involves an examination of the underlying assumptions, logical coherence, and real-world effects of different existing theories. By identifying the strengths and weaknesses of each theory, this research aims to provide a balanced assessment. Conceptual analysis is a kind of comparative analysis of the existing theories. It highlights their similarities, differences, and relative merits. This comparative approach helps to situate the proposed perspective within the broader philosophical landscape. This study employs normative reasoning to develop a new perspective on distributive justice. This involves constructing ethical arguments and philosophical justifications for the proposed framework, drawing on the principles of dignity, equality and fairness. This approach is appropriate for exploring theories of justice and distributive justice, as it allows us to explore abstract ideas and ethical principles and their implications for society. Given the theoretical nature of this inquiry, this study seeks to critically engage with existing theories of justice, identify their

strengths and limitations, and propose a new perspective fostering a just and harmonious society.

Overview of the Chapters of the Thesis

Chapter I, ***The Spheres of Justice: Concepts and Conflicts*** attempts to understand the origination, meaning and evolution of the concept of justice. The significance of this chapter lies in understanding the philosophy of justice. Any comprehensive analysis of a conception helps to understand the philosophical framework of the concept. Hence, this chapter will help to grasp the philosophical framework of justice. To understand the philosophy of justice, we begin with a discussion about the origination of the conception of justice i.e., how the idea of justice has come into existence in society. Following the discussion, we have tried to understand the meaning of justice put forward by various thinkers and institutions. Then, we introduced and examined the conceptions of justice proposed by philosophers from ancient Greeks to present-day contemporary philosophers. To better comprehend the evolution of the idea of justice, we have classified the philosophers into three groups according to their periods. These are classical conceptions of justice, modern conceptions of justice and contemporary conceptions of justice. In 'Classical Conceptions of Justice' we explored the notions of justice provided by early Greek philosophers such as Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. In 'Modern Conceptions of Justice' we concentrated on the 'social-contract' theorists such as John Locke, Thomas Hobbes and Jean-Jaque Rousseau. In addition, we briefly discussed the views of philosophers of the subsequent centuries such as David Hume, Immanuel Kant, John Stuart Mill and others. The 'Contemporary Conceptions of Justice' mainly focuses on the ideas of justice of the late 20th century. Beginning with John Rawls, Amartya Sen, Ronald Dworkin, and Robert Nozick's conception of justice have been discussed. Following the discussion, we precisely introduced the principles and types of justice. We concluded the chapter with the remarks that justice is a dynamic concept. With the progress of civilisation, the idea of justice has also changed its dimensions. In ancient times, justice was connected mainly with the legal and moral aspects of the individual and state, the focus of the contemporary conceptions of justice is the distribution and redistribution of primary social goods, therefore, to establish an egalitarian society.

Chapter II, ***Distributive Justice: Perspective and Dimensions*** can be considered the commencement of the primary theme of our thesis. As the title "Beyond Distributive Justice: A Quest for Social Justice" suggests, the thesis intends to critically analyse the theories of distributive justice and offer some new insights into them. Therefore, first of all, it is necessary to define distributive justice. We should understand the meaning of the term 'distribution.' We should also know what are the things of distribution, who would be the beneficiary of distribution, and how the distribution should be carried out. The subject of how to distribute encompasses a wide range of issues, including what constitutes distributive justice. That is, what principles should be followed in the distribution? How far is the distribution justifiable? To grasp all these, the chapter begins with an overview of the conception of distributive justice. Then, an attempt has been made to understand the theories of distributive justice put forward by philosophers from the beginning to the present.

Chapter III, ***Libertarian Criticism of Liberalism*** critically examines the liberal ideas of justice. In this chapter, we have mainly discussed the main tenets of liberalism and the libertarians' arguments against liberalism. Since its inception liberalism has been criticised in many ways by various groups of philosophers. The earliest critics are known as libertarians. The main thinkers within this tradition are Robert Nozick, Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman. Nozick is considered a strong critic of liberalism, particularly of Rawls. Libertarians criticise liberalism in many ways. The most serious accusation libertarians made against liberalism is that liberalism, particularly Rawls, legitimises the forced redistribution of wealth by emphasising distributive justice and difference principle. For libertarians, the excessive emphasis on the redistribution of wealth is an interference and violation of private ownership and individual rights to property. Libertarians argued that the individual's property rights, acquired fairly through the voluntary exchange and labour, are inviolable. Any state intervention in the property of the individuals is an absolute violation of the individual right to property.

Libertarians prioritise individual rights and liberty above all. For libertarians individual rights and liberty are more important than collective rights. Liberals try to balance equality with liberty, and hence advocate state interference in individual liberty for

the sake of fairness. However, libertarians don't entertain any such interference. Nozick argued that Rawls' 'original position' and the 'veil of ignorance' is a kind of contrived mechanism that ignores the idea of historical entitlements. Opposed to the liberals' idea of a more extensive state, libertarians argue for a minimal state. To ensure equality of opportunity and redistribution of resources, Rawls' liberalism advocates a kind of extensive state. Against this view, libertarians describe the state as a necessary evil and limit its role only in protecting individual rights. For them, the only duty of a state is to protect individuals against oppression, fraud, and theft. Nozick argues that any state beyond the minimal state is illegitimate because, for him, an extensive state interferes with individual freedom and violates individual rights. Another libertarian argument against Rawls' liberalism is that Rawls' difference principle, which allows social inequality for the interests of the disadvantaged, is morally arbitrary and overly restrictive. Nozick argues that Rawls' difference principle ignores the origination of inequality. For him, the distribution of resources should be based solely on voluntary exchange, regardless of the impact on the disadvantaged. If such distribution results in inequality, then it is just. In short, libertarians while criticising liberalism focus mainly on the three ideas advocated by liberalism—1. Its reliance on redistribution, 2. Its neglect of the historical entitlement or rights and, 3. Its prioritisation of social justice over individual rights. Against liberalism, Nozick and other libertarians advocate the idea of a minimal state that respects self-ownership, voluntary exchange, and procedural justice. However, in the concluding remarks of this chapter, we have mentioned that libertarianism also faced much criticism.

Chapter IV, ***Communitarian Critique of Libertarianism*** critically presents the debates between liberalism and communitarianism. Since the late 1980s, this liberal individualism has come under concerted attack by various political thinkers—now commonly known as Communitarians. In the context of social justice, in determining the nature of distributive justice and social harmony liberalism becomes central to the communitarian critique. In contemporary political philosophy, it is universally accepted that communitarianism has emerged mainly as a criticism of liberalism, to some extent as the critique of libertarianism. In their criticism, the main focus was John Rawls' *A Theory of Justice* since its appearance is considered the revival of political philosophy and modern liberalism. Along with Rawls, the philosophers most criticised by communitarians are

Ronald Dworkin and Robert Nozick who are also very much responsible for representing the libertarian tradition. Communitarians essentially rejected the individualist ideas of liberalism and argued for a new social system for the citizens. Their main objective was to protect citizens from the threat of authoritarianism and as well as overcome the harmful effects of strong individualism and build an inclusive society.

The first use of the term 'communitarianism' can be traced back to sociology in the 1840s. The terms 'communitarian' and '*communautaire*' were simultaneously used by the English and French sociologists in their writings. Hence, the French dictionaries credited Etienne Cabet and Pierre-Joseph Proudhon as the first users of the term '*communautaire*'. But the Oxford English Dictionary credits Goodwyn Barmby, the founder of the Universal Communitarian Association, with the first use of the term, who in 1841 first coined the term to refer to the public philosophy involved in the development of experimental communities. Since then, the word communitarianism has been used as a synonym for 'socialism' and 'communism.' But when through the various struggles the meaning of the words 'socialism' and 'communism' became clear, the word communitarianism was no longer discussed as a synonym for them. As a result, the term communitarianism remains ambiguous and generally, the term 'communitarian' means a good life believing in the social or community life.

In the latter half of the 20th century, especially in the 1980s, this kind of communitarian thought emerged mainly as a reaction to the thought of contemporary liberal political philosophers. At this time, various philosophers and thinkers began to widely discuss various concepts of public policy such as community policing, community justice, community health etc. and the term 'community' became so important that they started to associate the term with democracy, freedom, equality, empowerment etc. As a result, an ethical and political debate emerged about the relative responsibilities of individual rights, society, community and state. In this debate, some thinkers gave the greatest importance to the community and placed the role of the community above the individual and state. The "emphasizes the value of community as such, we can hear voices of people who wish more than anything to participate in building and sustaining communities—for whom the major political and social problem is 'the state of streets and

communities." The philosophers who played a leading role in spreading this kind of thinking are Michael Sandel, Alasdair MacIntyre, Charles Taylor, Michael Walzer, Amitai Etzioni, Phillip Selznick etc. In contemporary political philosophy, the thoughts of these philosophers are known as Communitarianism.

The Chapter, entitled ***The Synthesis of Liberalism and Communitarianism: A Perspective*** is a conclusive chapter where an attempt has been made to reconcile liberalism and communitarianism. In conclusion, we have argued that liberalism undoubtedly is one of the most admirable theories of distributive justice because of its priority for individual liberty and freedom, which is the primary condition for the development of individuals. However, at the same time, we cannot deny the role of society in individual life. The development of an individual is inextricably connected to the shared values of social life. Indeed, an individual is shaped and developed by the shared values of the community, he takes birth and grows up. However, considering individuals as an integral part of a community, we cannot ignore the value of personal liberty, freedom and distinct consciousness of an individual outside his social life. Therefore, to establish a just and harmonious social order we must equally consider both approaches.

Since ancient times, the dream of a just society has been a central theme in political philosophy. Even today, philosophers and thinkers continue to strive towards its realisation. Ideologies such as socialism, liberalism, libertarianism and communitarianism have emerged as part of this effort and each of them independently provided a framework for a just social system. While each perspective made significant contributions, it is undeniable that no single ideology provided a complete blueprint for establishing a just society. Every ideology has constructive aspects as well as destructive aspects. In this context, we contend that distributive justice, on its own, cannot fully establish a truly just society. Achieving true justice requires more than the fair distribution of resources. Therefore, we argue that neither liberalism nor communitarianism—nor any single tradition of justice—can independently offer a fully adequate conception of justice. In other words, we claim that neither liberalism nor communitarianism, in isolation, can establish a just and harmonious society. As a doctrine of justice, liberalism prioritises individual rights, autonomy, and universal principles, often overlooking community and cultural

dimensions of social life. In contrast, communitarianism emphasises shared values, cultural heritage, and social cohesion, sometimes at the expense of individual freedoms. Therefore, we contend that establishing a just and harmonious society requires a balance of liberal values and communitarianism; one that will protect individual freedom while preserving the moral and social foundations essential for the well-being of community life.

It is undeniable that liberalism has historically played an important role in ensuring individual freedom, autonomy, and equality. The liberal commitment to human rights, the rule of law, and democratic governance provide necessary protections against oppression and discrimination. However, the most serious accusation against liberalism is that liberals' excessive emphasis on individual freedom and autonomy leads them towards individualism. As a result, it isolates individuals from society and undermines social bonds and shared values. When justice is conceived solely in the sense of procedural neutrality—without recognising the cultural and moral context that shapes human life—the essential conditions for meaningful human development risk being overlooked. In contrast, communitarianism asserts that individuals are not isolated and atomistic agents; rather they are beings historically and culturally constituted by the shared values of their community. From this perspective, a strong sense of kinship and shared values are fundamental to building a stable and just society. However, if communitarian thinking is taken to extremes, it can justify exclusionary practices, suppress individual freedom and autonomy, or prioritise the majority values over universal rights. It can be said that, a society that places too much emphasis on community identity and values and ignores individual freedom runs the risk of becoming too oppressive rather than just. Hence, we argue that a synthesis between liberalism and communitarianism can provide a stronger framework or coherent vision for establishing a just society.

Establishing a just society requires a reflexive and dynamic approach, which will recognise the complementarity of liberalism and communitarianism rather than treating them as opposing ideologies. Political institutions must adapt to changing social realities so that policies reflect evolving rather than static notions of justice. Democratic deliberation, inclusive decision-making, and a commitment to pluralism must be integral to this process. So, a just society is not just a static ideal but a dynamic project, which seeks to reconcile

individual freedom with the community's well-being in an ever-evolving social and political landscape.

In political theory, the synthesis of liberalism and communitarianism could provide a balanced framework for establishing a just society. It can deal with the tension between individualism and the collective good. This integration of liberal values and communitarian ideals recognises that individual freedom can only be truly protected when accompanied by a sense of social responsibility. As Charles Taylor has argued, "The free individual is only possible within a culture that sustains and nurtures the conditions of freedom."[xix] The synthesis of both ideologies serves a dual purpose: on the one hand, it prevents the spread of excessive individualism—which leads to social fragmentation, and on the other hand, avoids the exaggeration of collectivist ideologies—which can suppress individual freedom and autonomy. Moreover, a mixed approach creates a political system that encourages active citizenship. As Michael Sandel argues, "a more robust public engagement with moral and civic questions can realize democracy."[xx] By combating liberal values with civic duty emphasised by communitarianism, societies can cultivate a more engaged, participatory, and resilient democratic order.

From an ethical viewpoint, reconciling liberalism and communitarianism has significant implications for contemporary social and political affairs. For example, in multicultural societies, justice consists of protecting the rights of minorities and fostering common civic values. The government ought to go beyond playing a bystander's role concerning cultural diversity and proactively promote an environment where ethnic communities will be able to interact, share ideas, and collaborate towards the greater good. In the same way, economic justice cannot solely rely on market-based liberalism, rather it needs a commitment to social solidarity, distributive justice, and solidarity.

Above all, the synthesis of liberalism and communitarianism offers a comprehensive vision of justice that recognises the values of both—individual autonomy and community involvement. Just as a just society cannot be built solely on abstract individual rights, it cannot be established solely on shared traditions and cultural connections. Building a just social order requires integrating the dimensions of both

ideologies—upholding individual freedoms within a framework of shared moral and civic commitments. Therefore, we argue that by blending liberal and communitarian values it may be possible to create a just, inclusive, and democratic society that not only protects individual freedom but also fosters the social bonds essential to justice. In this era of diversity, where globalization and complex democratic governance require approaches to justice that are both principled and context-sensitive, this synthesis is not only desirable but also necessary. Our task is to refine and institutionalise this approach, ensuring that justice remains a dynamic and evolving pursuit which will embrace both individual autonomy and the moral enrichment of the community.

To achieve a true synthesis of liberalism and communitarianism, society must embrace a model of citizenship that will uphold both—individual freedom and civic responsibility. To do this, liberal democratic institutions must uphold individuals' rights and security, while fostering a social and political environment that encourages engagement, participatory democracy, and collective solidarity. This method acknowledges that achieving justice involves more than just granting everyone equal legal rights; it is also about ensuring the conditions for individuals to exercise their social and moral freedoms within a supportive and interconnected community. In short, we aim to propose an alternative model of justice that goes beyond the limitations of distributive justice. We have highlighted the limitations of distributive justice and shown that equitable social justice cannot be achieved only through the distribution of resources. We want to present a justice model which seeks to establish a just society by addressing structural, relational, and recognition-based injustices. A just society necessitates the inclusion of fundamental elements such as recognition, participation, and strong social relationships. It is only by integrating these elements that it is possible to build an inclusive, equitable and sustainable society.

Endnotes

[i]Sergey Trostyanskiy, "The Philosophical Tenets and Content of Augustine's Social Doctrine," *Augustine and Social Justice*, edited by Teresa Delgado, John Doody, and Kim Paffenroth (Lexington Books, 2015), 42.

[ii] Ibid., 42.

[iii] Ibid., 43.

[iv] Earnest Barker, *Greek Political Theory—Plato and his Predecessors* (Oxford University Press, 195), 204.

[v] Aristotle, *Politics*, trans. Benjamin Jowett (Batoche Books, 1999), 6.

[vi] John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Harvard University Press, 1971), 3.

[vii] Earnest Barker, *Principles of Social and Political Theory* (Oxford University Press, 1952), 102.

[viii] Ibid., 177.

[ix] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. and ed. Roger Crisp (Cambridge University Press, 2004), 83.

[x] Marry T. Clark, "Augustine on Justice," in *Augustine and Social Justice*, edited by Teresa Delgado, John Doody, and Kim Paffenroth (London: Lexington Books, 2015), 3.

[xi] Ibid., 9.

[xii] Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* II-I, q.58, a.1.

[xiii] Ibid., 57, a.1..

[xiv] John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Harvard University Press, 1971), 3.

[xv] Ibid., 5.

[xvi] Ibid., 9.

[xvii] D. D. Raphael, *Concepts of Justice* (Oxford University Press, 2004), 2.

[xviii] Alex Rajczi, "What Is the Conservative Point of View About Distributive Justice?" *Public Affairs Quarterly* 28, no. 4 (October 2014): 344.

Bibiography

2. Abbey, Ruth and Taylor, Charles. "Communitarianism, Taylor-Made: An Interview with Charles Taylor." *The Australian Quarterly*, Vol. 68, No. 1, 1996, pp. 1-10.
3. Ahmad, S. Waseem and Ali, M. Ashraf. "Aspects of Justice." *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 72, No. 1, 2011, pp. 309-315. https://www.jstor.org/stable/42761831
4. Alejandro, Roberto. "Rawl's Communitarianism." *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 23, No. 1, 1993, pp. 75-99. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40231809
5. Altman, Matthew, editor. *The Palgrave Handbook of German Idealism*. Palgrave, 2014.
6. Anchordoguy, Marie. *Reprogramming in Japan: The High Tech Crisis under Communitarian Capitalism*. Cornell University Press, 2005.
7. Araujo, Calorina. *Cooperative Flourishing in Plato's 'Republic': A Theory of Justice*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2023.
8. Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated and edited by Roger Crisp, Cambridge University Press, 2004.
9. Aristotle. *Politics*. Translated by Benjamin Jowett, Batoche Books, 1999.
10. Aristotle. *Politics*. Translated by H. Rackham. *Aristotle in Twenty-Three Volumes*, Vol. 21, Harvard University Press, 1990.
11. Aronovitch, Hilliard. "From Communitarianism to Republicanism: On Sandel and His Critics." *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 30, No. 4, 2000, pp. 621-647.
12. Aurelio, Diogo P, et al., editors. *Sovereign Justice: Global Justice in a World of Nations*. Walter De Gruyter, 2011.
13. Baker, C. Edwin. "Sandel on Rawls." *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, Vol. 133, No. 4, 1985, pp. 895-928. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3312128
14. Baker, W. Raymond. *Justice in Islam: A Quest for the Righteous Community from Abu Dharr to Muhammad Ali*. Oxford University Press, 2022.
15. Banerjee, Debashish, editor. *Rabindranath Tagore in the 21st Century: Theoretical Renewals*. Springer, 2015.

16. Barker Earnest. *Principles of Social and Political Theory*. Oxford University Press, 1976.
17. Barker, Earnest. *Greek Political Theory—Plato and His Predecessors*. Methuen & Co Ltd, 1960.
18. Barry, Brian. *The Liberal Theory of Justice: A Critical Examination of the Principal Doctrines in A Theory of Justice by John Rawls*. Oxford University Press, 1973.
19. Bell, Daniel. *Communitarianism and Its Critics*. Oxford University Press, 1993.
20. Bell, Duncan. "What is Liberalism?" *Political Theory*, Vol. 42, No. 6, 2014, pp. 682-715. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24571524
21. Bellamy, Richard. *Liberalism and Pluralism: Towards a Politics of Compromise*. Routledge, 1999.
22. Bennett, John W. "Communes and Communitarianism." *Theory and Society*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 1975, pp. 63-94.
23. Berger, Fred R. "Mill's Substantive Principles of Justice: A Comparison with Nozick." *American Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 19, No. 4, Oct. 1982, pp. 373-380. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20013978
24. Berman, Jessica. *Modernists Fiction, Cosmopolitanism, and the Politics of Community*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
25. Bernstein, Richard J. "Rorty's Liberal Utopia." *Social Research*, Vol. 57, No. 1, *Philosophy and Politics II*, 1990, pp. 31-72. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40970578
26. Buchanan, Allen E: "Assessing the Communitarian Critique of Liberalism." *Ethics*, Vol. 99, No. 4, 1989, pp. 852-882.
27. Calderon, Jose' Z, editor. *Race, Poverty, and Social Justice: Multidisciplinary Perspectives Through Service Learning*. Stylus Publishing, 2007.
28. Camilleri, Joseph A. *Civilization in Crisis: Human Prospects in a Changing World*. Cambridge University Press, 1976.

29. Campbell, T. D. "Rights Without Justice." Mind, Vol. 83, No. 331, 1974, pp. 445-448. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2252750

30. Caney, Simon. "Sandel's Critique of the Primacy of Justice: A Liberal Rejoinder." *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 21, No. 4, 1991, pp. 511-521. http://www.jstor.org/stable/193774

31. Caney, Simon: "Liberalism and Communitarianism: A Misconceived Debate." *Political Studies*, Xl, 1992, pp. 273-289.

32. Capeheart, Loretta, and Milovaovic, Dragan. *Social Justice: Theories, Issues, and Movements*. Rutgers University Press, 2007.

33. Castro, Elisabetta Di. "Globalization, Inequalities and Justice." *Philosophy of Globalization*, edited by Concha Roland et al., De Gruyter, 2018. https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvbkk12k.12

34. Chang, Ya Lan. "Communitarianism, Properly Understood." *Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence*, Vol. XXXV, No. 1, 2022, pp. 117-139.

35. Chatterjee, Margaret. *Gandhi's Religious Thought*. The Macmillan Publishing Ltd, 1983.

36. Chatterji. Rakhahari. *Gandhi and the Ali Brothers: Bibliography of a Friendship*. SAGE Publication India Pvt Ltd., 2013.

37. Chen, Yixin. "The Justificatory Argument for Redistribution and Welfare State." *Asian Social Science*, Vol. 16, No. 12, 2020. https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v16n12p1

38. Choptiany, Leonard. "A Critique of John Rawls's Principles of Justice." *Ethics*, Nol. 83, No. 2, Jan. 1973, pp. 146-150. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2380099

39. Clark, P. John. *The Impossible Community: Realizing Communitarian Anarchism*. Bloomsbury Academics, 2013.

40. Cohen, Andrew Jason. "Does Communitarianism Require Individual Independence?" *The Journal of Ethics*, Vol. 4, No. 3, 2000, pp. 283-305.

41. Collins, Irene. "Liberalism in Nineteenth-Century Europe." *The Historical Association*, G-34, 1962, pp. 1-25.

42. Collins, Michael. Empire, Nationalism and the Postcolonial World: Rabindranath Tagore's Writings on History, Politics and Society. Routledge, 2012.

43. Conybeare, John A. C. "Efficiency, Entitlements and Deservingness: Perspectives on International Distributive Justice." *Review of International Political Economy*, Vol. 14, No. 3, Aug. 2007, pp. 389-411. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25261919

44. Cook, Karen S and Hegtvedt, Karen A. "Distributive Justice, Equity, and Equality." *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 9, 1983, pp. 217-241.

45. Coquereau, Elise. "Modernism and Modernity in Rabindranath Tagore." *Journal of Global Literary Studies*, 3, 2014, pp. 83-100.

46. Corlett, Angelo J. *Race, Rights, and Justice*. Springer, 2009.

47. Dagger, Richard. "Communitarianism and Republicanism." *Handbook of Political Theory*, edited by Gerald F. Gaus and Chandran, Kukathas, Sage Publications, 2004.

48. Dagger, Richard. "The Sandelian Republic and the Encumbered Self." *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 61, No. 2, 1999, pp. 181-208. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1408353

49. Dagger, Richard. *Civic Virtues: Rights, Citizenships, and Republican Liberalism*. Oxford University Press, 1997.

50. Dalacoura, Katerina: "A Critique of Communitarianism with reference to Post-Revolutionary Iran." *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 1, 2002, pp. 75-92.

51. Daniels, Norman, editor. *Reading Rawls: Critical Studies on Rawls' A Theory of Justice*. Basic Book, 1989.

52. Darwall, Stephen. *Honor, History, and Relationship: Essays in Second-Personal Ethics II*. Oxford University Press, 2013.

53. Dasgupta, Tapati. *Social Thought of Rabindranath Tagore: A Historical Analysis*. Avinab Publication, 1993.

54. Davis, Lawrence. "Comments on Nozick's Entitlement Theory." *The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 73, No. 21, 1976, pp. 836-844. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2025404

55. Davis, Michael. "Necessity and Nozick's Theory of Entitlement." Political Theory, Vol. 5, No. 2, 1977, pp. 219-23. https://www.jstor.org/stable/190730

56. Day, Graham. *Community and Everyday Life*. Routledge, 2006.

57. Delgado, Teresa, et al., editors. *Augustine and Social Justice*. Lexington Books, 2015.

58. Dent, N. J. H. *Rousseau: An Introduction to his Psychological, Social and Political Theory*. Basil Blackwell, 1988.

59. DiQuattro, Arthur. "Rawls Versus Hayek." Political Theory, Vol. 14, No. 2, 1986, pp. 307-310. https://www.jstor.org/stable/191465

60. Dixon, John, Dogan, Rhys and Sanderson, Alan: "Community and Communitarianism: A Philosophical Investigation." *Community Development Journal*, Vol. 40, No. 1, 2005, pp. 4-16.